Approved Minutes - Tarset and Greystead NDP Steering Group, meeting held on 19th August 2014 at 10 am

Actions listed in bold

1. Introduction and apologies

Present: Darrell Jackson (Chair), Rex Cooper (Secretary), John Holland, David Watkins, Megan Nixon, Anne Monroe, Kevin Tipple (NCC). Apologies were received from Mary-Lou Downie, Jenny Ludman.

2. Minutes

The Minutes of the last full meeting of 5th August were approved.

All draft Minutes to go to Chair only for approval. Any other amendments to be made at the meeting itself, to avoid confusion. **[All to note]**

3. Matters arising from meeting of 5th August: actions in bold

No reply from Tony Gates at time of meeting to Group's request to extend Jenny's contract with NNPA (3 days per month); current contract has expired, so urgent to resolve.

Rex to contact Tony Gates urgently. [Rex]

Note: since last meeting, Tony Gates has agreed to meet Group on Thursday 28th August, 9.30, TVH.

The PC and Tony Gates are to be informed of any freelance work undertaken by Jenny for the Group.

Comments on policy. No feedback from Chris Anderson but Kevin is feeding back (Jenny away).

Responses to public consultation to be fed into policies, especially Heritage policy where there are several comments. **[All]**

MAIN AGENDA

4. Jenny's fee proposal:

Group unanimously in favour of accepting this, as representing the only way the policies and Plan writing can be achieved within agreed timescale. Group's acceptance to be confirmed when David has updated the PC as to her proposed role as consultant and when we hear from Tony Gates (Jenny has asked for proposal to be cleared with NNPA as a courtesy in view of her existing role there). **[Rex]**

5. <u>Conservation Policy and Heritage List [all action by Anne/Preston unless otherwise stated]</u>

Preston updated the Group on recent progress by himself, Anne & Mary-Lou, and Anne tabled the 1st draft of the Heritage policy. The key point is that the policy should place the onus on the applicant to consider/resolve the heritage implications of any planning application. The policy is based on English Heritage wording from their 'Good Practice Guide for Local Heritage Listing'. **Kevin/Jenny to confirm this is acceptable; this is not a planning document so using their wording should not be an issue. [Jenny/Kevin]**

The proposed Local Heritage List will not be in place until after the Plan is submitted. It will add to the local database, but Anne concerned to embed it fully into Plan, to ensure items on the List can be afforded the extra layer of protection outlined in our Policy Objective. Kevin felt that para. 4 page 1 of Rationale does work in this context, and can be retained; **add a similar statement to the Policy itself.**

The draft policy was discussed. At present it reads too much like guidance; **to firm up.**

The reference to local examples under each of the 4 headings in 1st box, page 2, is helpful; to retain (Kevin)

The Local Heritage List will be referred to as the 'emerging' List.

A key phrase in planning terms is 'undesignated' heritage assets; include in draft Policy in opening sentences. No point in duplicating NNPA existing heritage policy.

6. <u>Wider Lanehead/Lanehead and Greenhaugh policy</u>

All agreed this supplementary policy draft focuses rightly on specific local criteria.

Word 'new' (Policy bullet points 1) will be removed. Jenny to decide what will be coherent here in relation to policy on conversion of redundant buildings, and that there are no gaps between policies. **[Jenny]**

The Policy is briefly worded at present, in near-list format; Jenny to flesh out. **[Jenny]**

Greenhaugh:

Agreed to place the Greenhaugh boundary at the lane to Boughthill, not the Hall or bridge.

This move would keep the old tennis court/ riding school within Greenhaugh; could be a site for development. Map to be changed to reflect new position of village end-stop. **[S & D]**

Lanehead

There was discussion over the old settlement of Charlton West which included The Box and Knoppingsholme. Group decided to revert to historical boundary as no other approach has proved workable. Policy will state: Boundary definition of Lanehead to be based on old

township of Charlton West. Jenny to refine wording. (NB: planning application for Tarset station site is in pipeline; could be development along old railway line]. **[Jenny]**

John to add reference to Lanehead boundary to Greenhaugh/Lanehead policy. Policy then to be forwarded to Jenny/Kevin 'as is'. **[John]**

There will be overlaps between the 'general design' policy and the 'new build policy; to be considered at a later stage.

This policy is now very spatial, and hopefully meets Jenny's point that the policy needed a spatial component.

<u>Other policies taken under item 6:</u>

Community Assets Policy

David/Preston felt no policy is needed, as PC has opted to list formally the Parish's community assets (Jan Ashdown/Parish Clerk are progressing). Assets are: Holly Bush, Greenhaugh First School, Thorneyburn church, Sidwood. Orchard is owned by Parish, so is not on List; Kevin advised it should be added. Owners of properties on list have right to object. Problems on how to define Sidwood. It is most important to address the issue of community assets in Plan as 95% of respondents to recent consultation favoured protection of community assets. Kevin to see how other Plans have dealt with this **(Subsequent to the meeting, Kevin circulated examples, which throw new light on how to address this policy area; discuss at next meeting)** **[All]**

The issue of potential change of use of community assets (as opposed to sale) from pubs to shops etc, which in some cases can proceed without planning permission, was discussed; controls are applicable if an intended change is to residential. This is a national issue, currently being looked at by government. PC to be advised. **[David]**

General design policy.

Anne & Megan tabled a draft section on windows, representing a précis of wording in Spence & Dower's section 7. Having drafted this, they felt the policy would be too long if drafted in this way throughout. They also had concerns that it would be too prescriptive, and hence not acceptable in planning terms.

After discussion, it was suggested by David & agreed that the policy would be very short and simply state that the applicant must justify windows, doors etc in terms of Spence & Dyer document, section 7. Onus will then be on applicant. Words such as 'sympathetic to'/ appropriate/respectful are helpful, but these principles should not be overly detailed (John). Megan pointed out the old Spence & Dower design guide is rarely referred to in planning applications, so it is essential that the new guide is linked firmly to policy.

Modern design must be included in the policy, which at present focuses on conversion of vernacular housing. The Group also felt that in the 21st century new materials, including UPVC (plastic) windows must not be excluded.

[Megan/Anne to redraft policy]

7. Consideration of Tina's response to proposed alterations

The Group went through the document to discuss the points raised. At present, the status of the S & D document is that it is an evidence-based document that sits below the NDP; to be converted into a SPD in due course. Title of current document might be on the lines of: 'Tarset & Greystead: landscape characteristics, sensitivity & design as a guide to development'; discuss with Spence & Dower. Current aim is for Spence & Dower to convert this into a complete document that can be used separately as evidence base. **[All/S & D]**

There was discussion over separating the document into three sections on Landscape & sensitivity, design and settlement patterns, but the Group concluded the document was stronger as a whole.

The main points that emerged are as follows (where no point is itemised below, this means the Group agreed with Tina's response/had no further comment):

Page 1

Contents page: agreed to defer until document nearer completion

Gateway views: Group feel the additional views requested are necessary; this is landscape characterisation, not a Design Guide.

Maps showing National trails etc Ask Spence & Dower for quote for this extra work; 1 large fold-out map needed. Must be clear what we want to include.

Page 2

Limekiln: Megan has image; bring to meeting **[Megan]**

Page 3

Archaeological features: reference to archaeological features should go in all sections or none.

Section 4: bullet point 5: views on plan (page 24) to be discussed further with Spence & Dower; bullet point 12 (pages 29 & 30): High Newton needs further discussion (below)

Page 4

Bigger map, like proposals map: Spence & Dower to be invited to quote additionally for this, or NCC to do.

Donkleywood: the line is on the map – Preston will bring details to S & D meeting **[Preston[**

Bringing High Newton into Lanehead: discuss with Spence & Dower. Group is now proposing a historical boundary for Lanehead, based on the old township of Charlton West. Group does not therefore regard High Newton as an isolated cluster.

Maps saying what landscape character area they are in: Group would like colours to stand out more clearly.

Executive material: To discuss with S & D. Jenny may be asked to undertake this as a link between the NDP & the Design Guide.

Action: Group members to come to next meeting having considered what extra work on Design Guide & maps they would like to see undertaken

[All]

8. AOB

None

9. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 26th August, Tarset Village Hall, 10 am

Extra meeting (Tony Gates): Tuesday 28th August, 9.30, TVH.